

REMARKS

Please note the new attorney docket number, 152165, which replaces the prior attorney docket number 33078/US/2.

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 12 and 19 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Claim 21 is added to claim subject matter to which Applicants are entitled. Support is found throughout the specification and drawings, including without limitation in FIG. 24 and pages 27 and 42-47. No new matter is added. No range of equivalents is surrendered or intended to be surrendered.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,706) ("Fan I"), in view of Dowd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,755) ("Dowd"), and in view of Coates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,203,731) ("Coates"). Claims 8-9 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fan I, Dowd, Coates and further in view of Lango (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,690) ("Lango"). Claims 11, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fan I, Dowd, Coates and further in view of Lewin (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,578) ("Lewin"). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fan (U.S. Publication No. 20060233155) ("Fan II"), Dowd, Coates, Lewin, and further in view of Lango. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP 2143.03 (emphasis added). The combined references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

For example, Fan I, Dowd and Coates do not teach or suggest:

determining a channel corresponding to the packet...retrieving channel properties for the channel...determining, from the channel properties, whether the channel is a persistent channel...and, if the channel is a persistent channel, locally caching data from the packet in a core routing node in the network core,

as recited in claims 1 and 19, and similarly recited in claim 12. Coates, which is cited for purportedly teaching locally caching of data, does not teach or suggest conditionally caching data based on a determination of whether a channel is a persistent channel. Indeed, there is no teaching or suggestion of determining a channel corresponding to a packet and retrieving channel

properties for the channel in Coates. Fan I and Dowd likewise do not teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, Fan I, Dowd and Coates do not teach or suggest the above recited features and, therefore, do not render claims 1, 12 and 19 obvious.

The additionally cited references Lango, Lewn and Fan II do not teach or suggest these features or otherwise overcome the defects of Fan I, Dowd and Coates. Consequently, dependent claims 2-11, 13, 15-18, 20 and 21 are not rendered obvious for at least these reasons and their own independent features. For example, the combined references do not teach or suggest "locally caching data from the packet at an edge routing node, wherein data cached at the core routing node includes all data cached at the edge routing node and data cached at other locations," as recited in claim 10 and similarly recited in claim 21. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-21 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date: May 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Wooden

Reg. No. 43,997

ANDREWS KURTH LLP

1350 I Street, N.W.

Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202) 662-2700

Fax: (202) 662-2739